



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/607,642 | 06/26/2003 | Vincent J. Zimmer | 42P16429 | 8722 |

7590

06/26/2006

Cory G. Claassen
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

TREAT, WILLIAM M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2181

DATE MAILED: 06/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|

10 607 642

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|-------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER |
|----------|-------|

20060621

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The timely submission under 37 CFR 1.129(a) filed on 4/5/2006 is not fully responsive to the prior Office action because the examiner still considers the global interrupt handler to be an essential element of applicants' claimed invention and an inherent, essential element in each of applicants' independent claims. In applicants' paragraph 39 applicants state: "Turning now to FIGS 3 and 4B, a process 400B describes how legacy type hardware IRQs and native type hardware IRQs are managed when processing system 300 is operating in either the native mode runtime or the legacy mode runtime." There is no legacy type hardware IRQ which is not serviced at least in part by the global interrupt handler. In paragraph 36 applicants state: "One such native type ISR is global interrupt handler 370." In other words the global interrupt handler is an interrupt service routine (ISR) in native code which is essential to the servicing of each legacy type hardware interrupt request. This is inconsistent with applicants' definition of a "legacy type hardware interrupt request" as an interrupt request that is serviced by 16-bit code, and applicants have not offered a satisfactory explanation as to why they consider their definition valid in the context of their claims nor why they do not consider the global interrupt handler to be an inherent, essential element of their claims for servicing a legacy type hardware IRQ. Also, if it is an essential element of applicants' invention, since the global interrupt handler is an integral part of every servicing of a legacy type hardware IRQ, how can it be enabled by anything other than a US patent or US patent application, incorporated by reference (37 CFR 1.57(c)), as opposed to a reference to non-patent literature. Since the submission appears to be a *bona fide* attempt to provide a complete reply to the prior Office action, applicant is given a shortened statutory period of ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this letter, whichever is longer, to submit a complete reply. This shortened statutory period supersedes the time period set in the prior Office action. This time period may be extended pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a). If a notice of appeal and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) were filed prior to or with the payment of the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r), the payment of the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(r) by applicant is construed as a request to dismiss the appeal and to continue prosecution under 37 CFR 1.129(a). The appeal stands dismissed.

WILLIAM M. TREAT
PRIMARY EXAMINER